

Bull Trout Recovery Plan websites (Reviewed by Aria DalMolin)

“Bull Trout Recovery Plan.” U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service website <http://pacific.fws.gov/bulltrout/recover/> April 14, 2004.

The bull trout is a very threatened species in the Willamette River basin; these three web sites gave more information on the subject. The first site, “Bull Trout Draft Recovery Plan,” explained the situation and the area where the recovery plan was proposed to take place. Two hundred miles of streams are proposed for critical habitat along the McKenzie River and the Willamette River area. It described how private biologists came up with the recovery plan, and who would be affected by the recovery plan. For instance, Federal agencies will be required consult the Fish and Wildlife Services on every action that they carry out, fund, or authorize that might affect the critical habitat area. At this moment, the plan states, “In 1998, bull trout in the upper McKenzie River above Trail Bridge Reservoir were considered at high risk of extinction”(Bull Trout Recovery Plan, 2).

“Department of the Interior Fish and Wildlife Service.” National Archives and Records Administration. Friday, November 29, 2002. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service website <http://pacific.fws.gov/bulltrout/crithab/crithabrule.pdf> April 14, 2004.

This site included the legal proposal to the Department of the Interior on the proposed recovery area. The document was very long with a lot of legal language that basically went over the exact area that would be considered critical habitat area for the fish and why it should be considered for a recovery habitat area.

“Frequently Asked Questions About Proposed Critical Habitat for Bull Trout.” U.S. Fish and Wildlife website. http://pacific.fws.gov/bulltrout/Q&A_crithab.pdf April 14, 2004.

This site answered frequently asked questions that common everyday people would normally ask about the proposed recovery area and what is going on with the bull trout species. It answers the questions, why is the service proposing a critical habitat area, what is the critical habitat, how did the service determine the need for a critical habitat for the bull trout, how would the bull trout benefit from this area, who would be affected, who owns the land of the critical habitat area, and other questions such as these.

Critique

These articles were informative and written for a general audience. The “Bull Trout Recovery Plan” article and the “Questions” article were both in common language and clearly described the problem occurring with the bull trout, then went on to clearly mark out the area that would be affected by this recovery plan and how one could get involved to help the recovery of this species. The language was common at times and some of the information, simple; however, the documents also went into scientific

information such as the criteria to measure the progress of the species and the economics of the issue, such as the cost of the project and the cost to companies and other agencies. Therefore these articles were very informative and understandable resources.

The legal document of the proposal to the department of the interior was much less informative and easy to read. The language was very dry and written for lawyers. It went into painful detail mapping out the proposed habitat area. The scientific information backing the need for the proposed habitat area, however, was very helpful information and much less watered-down and generalized than the other two articles. Therefore, this was a source for a little information, but it was difficult to decipher the useful scientific information from the legal details.

[return to info sources page](#)

[return to home page](#)